APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,976	08/04/2003	Osamu Suzuki	2271/70770	5636

7590   04/24/2009

Ivan S. Kavrukov, Esq.
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER
DICKERSON, CHAD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/633,976	SUZUKI, OSAMU
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAD DICKERSON	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 January 2009</u>.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>14-30</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>14-30</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 March 2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the same references of Tomida '255 and McAfee '889 are both still being applied to the claims. The Applicant presented expressed many assertions regarding the application of the Tomida reference. For example, Applicant's representative asserts that the one-touch keys mentioned in Tomida cannot be considered as analogous to user codes since these keys are not specific to an operator and differentiates the operators from other operators of the apparatus. It is also asserted that the combined references do not disclose the feature of having multiple subject names for a user code. The Examiner would like to briefly address these contentions below[1].

Regarding the assertion of not disclosing the specific user code, the Examiner believes that the Tomida reference is still applicable to the claim language. It is clear that the user codes certain one-touch keys for title and address designation within the Tomida reference (Tomida)[2]. When viewing the claim language, the Examiner believes that Tomida still reads on the code determination feature that determines whether a specific code programmed by the user has been specified. The Examiner is no longer using the Watanabe reference, but is instead using the McAfee reference (McAfee) and newly applied reference Rachelson to disclose the claim limitations. McAfee is a reference that involves entering a user Account number and Pin in order to ensure that

---

[1] See pages 9 and 10 of remarks filed 1/29/2009.

the user has the authority to use the system[3]. In the McAfee system, it is apparent that

there may be others that can use the system as well. The Log on data can easily be

used to differentiate users who have valid login data to use the system versus those

who do not have valid login data.

However, at this point, if the Applicant still believes that the claim feature is still

not met clearly by the McAfee reference, then the Examiner would turn the Applicant's

attention to the Rachelson reference. In Rachelson, the current user has to login into

an EPO (electronic post office) that contains various features for different users on the

EPO[4]. Since different users may have different sets of functions allotted to them, the

login information is used to differentiate a current user operating the system from other

users also utilizing the system for message delivery and reception. Therefore, with the

combination of references, the Examiner believes the feature of "a specific user code,

specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other

operators of the communication apparatus" is performed.

Regarding the next assertion of multiple subject names being associated with a

user code, the Examiner would like to point the Applicant's representative to the current

claim language in the independent claims related to this assertion. For example, in

claim 14, the claim language states "*subject name registration part ... registered user

codes, corresponding **one or more** subject names associated...*". The current claim

language can contain one subject name for an associated registered user code and the

subject name specifying part can determine a subject name from the one subject name

---

[2] See Tomida '706 at col. 4, ln 2 – col. 6, ln 10.

registered for the specific user code. When looking at the claim language, previously

recited the subject name registration part can associate **one** or more subject names

with a registered user code, but the subject name specifying part determines a subject

name from among subject **names** registered for a user code. If the system only

associates one subject name for a registered user code, then the claim language in the

subject name specifying part creates a discrepancy that raises an indefinite issue.

Despite the above conclusion about the claim language, the Examiner noticed

that Applicant's assertion of a plurality of subject names are presented through the

dependent claims since these are the claims that clearly require plural subject names

stored to a specific user code. However, with the newly applied Rachelson reference,

this feature is disclosed as well. In Rachelson, once a user logs into their account, the

user is able to view messages stored, or registered, in the archive. The messages of

Rachelson are stored in a database and they contain the title, or subject, of the actual

message[5]. The stored messages in association with a user's account are considered

as a plurality of subject names that are registered for a specific user code of the

operator of the facsimile and subject names registered for the specific user code of the

current operator. In addition, since multiple users are able to use this system and have

archived messages that contain titles for each message, the Rachelson reference

performs the feature of containing a plurality of registered user codes, or passwords,

that are associated with a plurality of facsimile system users and each user account can

contain a plurality of subjects of the archived messages stored on the database.

---

[3] See McAfee '889 at paragraphs [0025]-[0029].

With the combination of the Rachelson reference with the Tomida and McAfee

references, the claim limitations alleged to not be performed are believed to be

disclosed by the combined references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 14-18 and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 14 and 22: The phase "corresponding one or more subject names associated

with the registered user code" renders the claim indefinite. As explained in the

arguments above, if the system only associates one subject name to the user code,

then the claim language regarding the subject name specifying part is indefinite since it

is trying to determine a subject name from among the subject names (plural), but in the

above step, there is only one not many subject names that are registered for the

specific user code. The Examiner would like more clarification regarding these claim

features if the subject name registration part registers only one subject name for a

registered user code. The dependent claims are also rejected because of their

dependency.

---

[4] See Rachelson '706 at col. 7, ln 25 – col. 9, ln 35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tomida '255 (USP 6922255) in view of McAfee '889 (US Pub No 2004/0021889) and

Rachelson (USP 6157706).

Re claim 14: Tomida '255 discloses a network facsimile apparatus comprising:

image information scanner part configured to scan an original and output image

data corresponding to the scanned original (i.e. the scanner (47) is used for reading an

image from an original document and the image data is output by using the facsimile

device (1) for transmission through the modem (59); see figs. 1-3; col. 3, lines 57-65

and col. 4, lines 1-60);

display part including a predetermined display unit (i.e. the LCD (57) displays

various messages, such as operational procedures and error messages. It also

functions as a touch panel; see fig. 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

image data transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive

image data via a public network (i.e. the modem (59) is used for performing

transmission and reception of facsimile communications between the public network

(32) and the circuit controller (61). The circuit controller (61) is used for transmitting and

---

[5] Id. at col. 9, lines 3-55.

responding to calls by the public network (32); see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and

col. 4, lines 1-60);

mail transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive mail data

via a network (i.e. the mail controller (65) is used for converting facsimile data into e-

mail data to be transmitted and converts e-mail data received; see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3,

lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

code determination part configured to determine whether a specific user code

has been specified (i.e. in the system, the one-touch keys are considered as the specific

user code since the one-touch keys are codes that represent titles or other receiving

apparatuses that are specified when the user activates or enters in the one-touch key in

the system. The system determines whether a certain one-touch key is specified when

a user wants to transmit a email or fax to a person or to save information relating to the

fax, email or title coded on the one-touch key; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5,

lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34);

subject name registration part configured to register for each of a plurality of

registered user codes, corresponding one or more subject names associated with the

registered user code (i.e. in the system, the one touch keys are considered as the user

codes since these one-touch keys are coded by the user with information that is being

used by the facsimile device. In the system, the user registers titles to one-touch keys

in the system. A plurality of one-touch keys is used to register a plurality of titles that

can be associated with the one-touch keys. Also, interpreting the phrase "subject

name" broadly in terms of the claim, the one-touch keys can be used to also register the

name of the person, or subject, receiving the email or fax; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-

67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-10); and

subject name specifying part configured to automatically determine a subject

name from among the subject names registered (i.e. in the system, when the user

wants to send a fax or email and activates the code of the one-touch key, the system

automatically specifies the name of the receiving party, or the name of the subject

receiving the transmission, that is registered for the one-touch key. Also, if the user

only wants to send an email, the system can automatically specify one of the titles

registered for the one-touch keys once the user has chosen a respective one-touch key

for the desired title. Lastly, the system can automatically choose a default title for an

email after an email address of a receiving party has been specified and a title has not

been specified by a one-touch key. Since a default title can chosen from the memory

(45e and 45f) automatically from the subject names registered for the user in the title

storage area (45d), which is also stored in connection with a one-touch key; see figs. 3-

7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67, col. 7, lines 1-34 and col. 8, line

25 – col. 9, line 31) and registered in the subject name registration part, as the

transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted (i.e. the name of the

subject receiving the transmission is broadly considered as the subject name and this

can be registered in the part of the system that registers these receiving parties to a

one-touch key. Also, the titles in the system are registered in the user's area (45f) that

is used to register titles. These same titles are used in the email to be transmitted to the

receiving party. Since the email is transmitted with the overall email as the title of the

email, this can be considered as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34).

However, Tomida '255 fails to specifically teach a specific user code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication apparatus and subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee '889 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator (i.e. the user account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]) and

subject name registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. In paragraph [0025], it states that this information can be obtained from memory. Specifically in paragraph [0029], when validation of the user name and password occurs with the email server (which can be analogous to a fax gateway), then the MFP used then forwards related information that is considered as the message header (i.e. information containing a subject of an email, sending and receiving email addresses) to the email server. This is an example of a system that contains a subject

and email addresses of recipients of information that are registered in memory in
relation to the specific user login information of the current operator of the facsimile
device; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the subject name
registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device
of Tomida '255, in order to have user authentication data for verification prior to
enabling transmission of the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee
'889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee fails to specifically teach
differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication
apparatus and subject names registered for the specific user code of the current
operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.
Rachelson '706 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator and
differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication
apparatus (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida reference since both
inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another user's address (same
field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a user logging into an
account that may have different privileges than other accounts. The system has a user
to enter in account information, such as an account number and password, which
differentiates users on the EPO system; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35) and subject

names registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. since the current

user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the system than

others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a current operator.

Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on the database

contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the feature of having

subject names registered for a specific user code of the current operator of a user

operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of a specific user

code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other

operators of the communication apparatus and the subject names registered for the

specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as

modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log into a system using

an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 15: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 14, wherein

a plurality of subject names with respective specified priorities are registered for the

specific user code (i.e. in the system, the titles, considered as the subject names, have

priorities when the titles need to be designated for an email. For example, if a user is

prompted to enter for the title input, the system gives a higher priority to the one-touch

and direct input methods and gives the lower priority to the default input method. These

titles can be registered in the user's area (45d-f) and in the one-touch keys, considered

as the specific user codes. The one-touch keys are considered as the specific user

codes because the user sets these specific titles or names of the receiving parties to be

coded on the one-touch keys. In the above example, the titles related to the one-touch

keys are given a higher priority than the titles in the default title area (45e); see fig. 10;

col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31), and

said subject name specifying part automatically specifies one of the registered

subject names having a highest priority as the transmission subject name of the mail

data to be transmitted (i.e. in the system, if the user decides to use the one-touch key

method for the title input, the system automatically specifies the respective title that has

a higher priority to be chosen by the user to be placed in a email to be transmitted with

the rest of the email information to a receiving party. This performs the above feature

since the one-touch key title has a higher priority than a default title and the one-touch

key title is used as the title to be transmitted with the email; see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-

67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for

the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user

code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida

reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another

user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a

user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts.

Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the

system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a

current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on

the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the

feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current

operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names

registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device

of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log

into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col.

7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 16: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 14, wherein

said subject name specifying part determines whether a subject name previously

specified for preferential use is one of the subject names registered for the specific user

code (i.e. in the system, the titles that are specified for preferential use are registered

and then coded on a one-touch key. The whole purpose of the one-touch key is to

ensure that if a user prefers to use a certain title a frequent amount of time, the user

only has to activate the key in order to gain access to the title. The system recognizes if

this same title that the user has coded on the one-touch key is specified by the user on

the facsimile device; see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31), and

if said subject name for preferential use is one of the subject names registered

for the specific user code, said subject name specifying part automatically specifies said

subject name for preferential use as the transmission subject name of the mail data to

be transmitted (i.e. in the system, once a title registered and coded for a one-touch key

is specified, the system performs the feature of specifying the title and using that title to

be included in the email information so that the title can be transmitted together with the

email information. If the user does not want to use the preferred title using the one-

touch key, the user can prefer to simply use the default title in the system; see fig. 10;

col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee

is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to

send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of

McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the

memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. The user

account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a

current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the specific user code of

the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, in order to have user

authentication data for verification prior to enabling transmission of the message header

data for an email (as stated in McAfee '889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee '889 fails to teach a

plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user

code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida

reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another

user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a

user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts.

Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the

system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a

current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on

the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the

feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current

operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 17: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706 are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 14, wherein a plurality of subject names are registered (i.e. in the system, one-touch keys are coded by the user with a specific code relating to a receiving party or a title. A plurality of titles or receiving parties can be registered for a specific one-touch key. If a user wants to change the title to another title, the process of overwriting a one-touch key is performed. A number of titles can be registered and coded for a single one-touch key; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34), and

said plurality of subject names registered are displayed on said display part for selection by the operator (i.e. in the system, when a user is given the choice to select a certain title, the titles that are registered in the system and coded on the respective one-touch keys are displayed on a LCD (57) so that the user can select the title desired to be included in an email. The titles are both registered and stored for the one-touch key

in order to give the user quick access to frequently used titles in the system; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, line 1 - col. 7, line 34).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706. Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts. Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names are registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 18: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile machine as claimed in claim 14, further

comprising address registration determination part configured to determine whether a

mail address is registered for the specific user code (i.e. the system can determine if an

address of an email that is received by the facsimile machine is registered on the

system and specifically registered for a one-touch key. If the user is trying to transmit a

facsimile using the one-touch key, the system looks at the registered coded data on the

one-touch key and checks to see if a mail address is registered and stored for the one-

touch key or if the on-touch key only has a facsimile number; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines

1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34),

    wherein said subject name specifying part specifies the mail address registered

for the specific user code as the transmission subject name when said address

registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the

specific user code (i.e. in figure 4, a name and an email address is associated with the

one-touch keys, which is considered as the identification codes. The one-touch key has

a mail address being registered as the address used for transmitting an email to another

facsimile device. This email address is designated, or specified, by the user. This

feature occurs when the actual subject names, or email address, in this scenario are not

registered and the user is asked in step 100 if the user would like to register the chosen

email address with the one-touch key. Also, since the mail address can be used as a

transmission subject name because any title of any kind can be used, the above feature

is performed. Therefore, the feature of specifying a mail address registered for the

specific user code as a transmission subject name when the subject name is

determined to not be registered for the mail data is performed; see fig. 4; col. 4, lines

57-66,col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee

is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to

send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of

McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the

memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. The user

account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a

current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the specific user code of

the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, in order to have user

authentication data for verification prior to enabling transmission of the message header

data for an email (as stated in McAfee '889 paragraph [0009]).

Re claim 19: Tomida '255 discloses a network facsimile apparatus comprising:

image information scanner part configured m scan an original and output image

data corresponding to the scanned original (i.e. the scanner (47) is used for reading an

image from an original document and the image data is output by using the facsimile

device (1) for transmission through the modem (59); see figs. 1-3; col. 3, lines 57-65

and col. 4, lines 1-60);

display part including a predetermined display unit (i.e. the LCD (57) displays

various messages, such as operational procedures and error messages. It also

functions as a touch panel; see fig. 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

image data transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive

image data via a public network (i.e. the modem (59) is used for performing

transmission and reception of facsimile communications between the public network

(32) and the circuit controller (61). The circuit controller (61) is used for transmitting and

responding to calls by the public network (32); see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and

col. 4, lines 1-60);

mail transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive mail data

via a network (i.e. the mail controller (65) is used for converting facsimile data into e-

mail data to be transmitted and converts e-mail data received; see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3,

lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

code determination part configured to determine whether a specific user code

has been specified (i.e. in the system, the one-touch keys are considered as the specific

user code since the one-touch keys are codes that represent titles or other receiving

apparatuses that are specified when the user activates or enters in the one-touch key in

the system. The system determines whether a certain one-touch key is specified when

a user wants to transmit a email or fax to a person or to save information relating to the

fax, email or title coded on the one-touch key; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5,

lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34);

address registration determination part configured to determine whether a mail

address is registered for the specific user code of the current operator, if said code

determination part determines that the specific user code has been specified (i.e. the

system can determine if an address of an email that is received by the facsimile

machine is registered on the system and specifically registered for a one-touch key. If

the user is trying to transmit a facsimile using the one-touch key, the system looks at the

registered coded data on the one-touch key and checks to see if a mail address is

registered and stored for the one-touch key or if the on-touch key only has a facsimile

number; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7,

lines 1-34); and

subject name specifying part configured to automatically specify another subject

name, based on the mail address registered for the specific user code, as the

transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted (i.e. in the system, another

title can be specified other than a title specified through a direct method, one-touch key

or through the default method. The title can be extracted from the actual document that

is being faxed or emailed. The title extracted from the document scanned is used as

the title of the document that will be transmitted as a fax or email. Since this title can be

a title of any kind, this title can be based on the mail address registered and coded on

the one-touch key by using the address of the one-touch key. Also, in the process of

figure 9, the use of another title in the process can not begin until the registered mail

address of the coded one-touch key is specified, so the process of automatically

specifying another title is performed. Lastly, with the subject name, or title, being

specified automatically by scanning certain parts of a document or choosing a default

title after none has been chosen, the feature of choosing another title, or subject name,

other than a subject name coded and directed to be used by on a one-touch key is

performed; see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7,

lines 1-67, col. 8, lines 1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31),

if said code determination part determines that the specific user code has been

specified and said address registration determination part determines that the mail

address is registered for the specific user code (i.e. the other title specified only occurs

after the one-touch key coded with the registered mail address is specified and the mail

address is determined to be registered and coded on the one-touch key is chosen to

begin the process of placing another title; see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-

67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-67, col. 8, lines 1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a specific user code, specific to a current

operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the network

facsimile apparatus and the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator and a specific user

code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee is similar to the systems of

Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to send emails with information

from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email

recipients and subject data may be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device

once a user's name and pin are verified. The user account number and Pin is

considered as a specific user code that is specific to a current operator; see paragraphs

[0024]-[0033]); and

mail address is registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e.

the system of McAfee is similar to the systems of Tomida and Watanbe since all the

inventions are able to send emails with information from the facsimile devices.

However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may

be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are

verified. In paragraph [0025], it states that this information can be obtained from

memory. Specifically in paragraph [0029], when validation of the user name and

password occurs with the email server (which can be analogous to a fax gateway), then

the MFP used then forwards related information that is considered as the message

header (i.e. information containing a subject of an email, sending and receiving email

addresses) to the email server. This is an example of a system that contains a subject

and email addresses of recipients of information that are registered in memory in

relation to the specific user login information of the current operator of the facsimile

device; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of a specific user code,

specific to a current operator and a specific user code of the current operator and mail

address is registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in

the device of Tomida '255, in order to have user authentication data for verification prior

to enabling transmission of the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee

'889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee fails to specifically teach a

specific user code, differentiating said current operator from other operators of the

communication apparatus.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a specific user code, differentiating said current operator from

other operators of the communication apparatus (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar

to the Tomida reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email

to another user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference

discloses a user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other

accounts. The system has a user to enter in account information, such as an account

number and password, which differentiates users on the EPO system; see col. 7, ln 41

– col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of a specific user

code, differentiating said current operator from other operators of the network facsimile

apparatus, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of

McAfee '889, in order to have a user log into a system using an account number and

password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 20: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile machine as claimed in claim 19, wherein

said subject name specifying part creates said another subject name, based on the mail

address registered for the specific user code (i.e. in the system, another title can be

specified other than a title specified trough a direct method, one-touch key or through

the default method. The title can be extracted from the actual document that is being

faxed or emailed. The title extracted from the document scanned is used as the title of

the document that will be transmitted as a fax or email. Since this title can be any title

of any kind, this title can be based on the mail address registered and coded on the

one-touch key by using the address of the one-touch key. Also, in the process of figure

9, the use of another title in the process can not begin until the registered mail address

of the coded one-touch key is specified, so the process of automatically specifying

another title is performed; see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines

1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-67, col. 8, lines 1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

Re claim 21: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile machine as claimed in claim 19, wherein said subject name specifying part appends the mail address registered for the specific user code to "From" (i.e. in the system, when an email is being sent, information regarding the email address of the receiving party and data regarding the information from the sending party is sent to the receiving party as an email. The mail address that is receiving the information is registered and coded on the one-touch key by the user. Although it is not specifically stated that the mail address that is appended in the "From" in the email, it is conventional and is performed in the system since the receiving party always is able to recognize whom the sending party is when receiving an email or a fax; see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-67, col. 8, lines 1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

Re claim 22: Tomida '255 discloses a network facsimile apparatus comprising:

image information scanner part configured to scan an original and output image data corresponding to the scanned original (i.e. the scanner (47) is used for reading an image from an original document and the image data is output by using the facsimile device (1) for transmission through the modem (59); see figs. 1-3; col. 3, lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

display part including a predetermined display unit (i.e. the LCD (57) displays various messages, such as operational procedures and error messages. It also functions as a touch panel; see fig. 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

image data transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive

image data via a public: network (i.e. the modem (59) is used for performing

transmission and reception of facsimile communications between the public network

(32) and the circuit controller (61). The circuit controller (61) is used for transmitting and

responding to calls by the public network (32); see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 57-65 and

col. 4, lines 1-60);

mail transmitting and receiving part configured to transmit and receive mail data

via a network (i.e. the mail controller (65) is used for converting facsimile data into e-

mail data to be transmitted and converts e-mail data received; see figs. 1 and 2; col. 3,

lines 57-65 and col. 4, lines 1-60);

code determination part configured to determine whether a specific user code

has been specified (i.e. in the system, the one-touch keys are considered as the specific

user code since the one-touch keys are codes that represent titles or other receiving

apparatuses that are specified when the user activates or enters in the one-touch key in

the system. The system determines whether a certain one-touch key is specified when

a user wants to transmit a email or fax to a person or to save information relating to the

fax, email or title coded on the one-touch key; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5,

lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34);

subject name registration part configured to register for each of a plurality of

registered user codes, corresponding one or more subject names associated with the

registered user code (i.e. in the system, the one touch keys are considered as the user

codes since these one-touch keys are coded by the user with information that is being

used by the facsimile device. In the system, the user registers titles to one-touch keys

in the system. A plurality of one-touch keys is used to register a plurality of titles that

can be associated with the one-touch keys. Also, interpreting the phrase "subject

name" broadly in terms of the claim, the one-touch keys can be used to also register the

name of the person, or subject, receiving the email or fax; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-

67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-10);

subject name specification determination part configured to determine whether

may subject names are specified for mail data to be transmitted (i.e. in the system,

when sending an email and the title has to be specified for the email, the determination

of whether a is selected to be transmitted with email data is performed; see figs. 3-9;

col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-67, col. 8, lines

1-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31); and

subject name specifying part configured to automatically specify one of the

subject names registered for the specific user code and registered in the subject name

registration part, as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted, if

the subject name specification determination part determines that no subject name is

specified for the mail data (i.e. in the system, a user is able to specify a one-touch key

designating a certain title registered and coded on the one-touch key. However, if a

user decides not to specify a title using the one-touch key method and the direct

method, the system can automatically place a default title on the email. The automatic

placing of the default title on the email is after the user has already used a one-touch

key for designating an address for a receiving party to receive an email. The title can

be placed with the email data after it may be extracted from an original document once

the system realizes the title input part is to be excluded because of the extracted title, or

the title may be placed in the email by default using the default title area, which can be

also be the area where the one-touch key titles are registered and coded. This

performs the feature of having the title selected by default being both registered in a

storage area and registered for coding on a one-touch key. Lastly, the system can

automatically choose a default title for an email after an email address of a receiving

party has been specified and a title has not been specified by a one-touch key. Since a

default title can chosen from the memory (45e and 45f) automatically from the subject

names registered for the user in the title storage area (45d), which is also stored in

connection with a one-touch key; see figs. 3-9; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col.

6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-67, col. 8, line 1 - col. 9, line 31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to specifically teach a specific user code, specific to a

current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the

communication apparatus and subject names registered for the specific user code of

the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator (i.e. the user account

number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a current

operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]) and

subject name registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the

system of McAfee is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the

inventions are able to send emails with information from the facsimile devices.

However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may

be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are

verified. In paragraph [0025], it states that this information can be obtained from

memory. Specifically in paragraph [0029], when validation of the user name and

password occurs with the email server (which can be analogous to a fax gateway), then

the MFP used then forwards related information that is considered as the message

header (i.e. information containing a subject of an email, sending and receiving email

addresses) to the email server. This is an example of a system that contains a subject

and email addresses of recipients of information that are registered in memory in

relation to the specific user login information of the current operator of the facsimile

device; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the subject name

registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device

of Tomida '255, in order to have user authentication data for verification prior to

enabling transmission of the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee

'889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee fails to specifically teach

differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication

apparatus and subject names registered for the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator and

differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication

apparatus (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida reference since both

inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another user's address (same

field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a user logging into an

account that may have different privileges than other accounts. The system has a user

to enter in account information, such as an account number and password, which

differentiates users on the EPO system; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35) and subject

names registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. since the current

user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the system than

others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a current operator.

Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on the database

contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the feature of having

subject names registered for a specific user code of the current operator of a user

operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of a specific user

code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other

operators of the communication apparatus and the subject names registered for the

specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as

modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log into a system using

an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 23: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 22, wherein

a plurality of subject names with respective specified priorities are registered (i.e. in the

system, the titles, considered as the subject names, have priorities when the titles need

to be designated for an email. For example, if a user is prompted to enter for the title

input, the system gives a higher priority to the one-touch and direct input methods and

gives the lower priority to the default input method. These titles can be registered in the

user's area (45d-f) and in the one-touch keys, considered as the specific user codes.

The one-touch keys are considered as the specific user codes because the user sets

these specific titles or names of the receiving parties to be coded on the one-touch

keys. In the above example, the titles related to the one-touch keys are given a higher

priority than the titles in the default title area (45e); see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-67 and

col. 9, lines 1-31), and

        said subject name specifying part automatically specifies one of the registered

subject names having a highest priority as the transmission subject name of the mail

data to be transmitted (i.e. in the system, if the user decides to use the one-touch key

method for the title input, the system automatically specifies the respective title that has

a higher priority to be chosen by the user to be placed in a email to be transmitted with

the rest of the email information to a receiving party. This performs the above feature since the one-touch key title has a higher priority than a default title and the one-touch key title is used as the title to be transmitted with the email; see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706. Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts. Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log

into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col.

7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 24: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 22, wherein

said subject name specifying part determines whether a subject name previously

specific for preferential use is one of the subject names registered for the specific user

code (i.e. in the system, the titles that are specified for preferential use are registered

and then coded on a one-touch key. The whole purpose of the one-touch key is to

ensure that if a user prefers to use a certain title a frequent amount of time, the user

only has to activate the key in order to gain access to the title. The system recognizes if

this same title that the user has coded on the one-touch key is specified by the user on

the facsimile device; see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31), and

if said subject name for preferential use is one of the subject names registered

for the specific user code, said subject name specifying part automatically specifies said

subject name for preferential use as the transmission subject name of the mail data to

be transmitted (i.e. in the system, once a title registered and coded for a one-touch key

is specified, the system performs the feature of specifying the title and using that title to

be included in the email information so that the title can be transmitted together with the

email information. If the user does not want to use the preferred title using the one-

touch key, the user can prefer to simply use the default title in the system; see fig. 10; col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee '889 discloses the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. The user account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, in order to have user authentication data for verification prior to enabling transmission of the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee '889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee '889 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706. Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida

reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another

user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a

user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts.

Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the

system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a

current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on

the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the

feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current

operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names

registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device

of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log

into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col.

7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 25: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile apparatus as claimed in claim 22, wherein

a plurality of subject names are registered for the specific user code (i.e. in the system,

one-touch keys are coded by the user with a specific code relating to a receiving party

or a title. A plurality of titles or receiving parties can be registered for a specific one-

touch key. If a user wants to change the title to another title, the process of overwriting

a one-touch key is performed. A number of titles can be registered and coded for a

single one-touch key; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67

and col. 7, lines 1-34), and

said plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code are displayed

on said display part for selection by the operator (i.e. in the system, when a user is

given the choice to chose a certain title, the titles that are registered in the system and

coded on the respective one-touch keys are displayed on a LCD (57) so that the user

can select the title desired to be included in an email. The titles are both registered and

stored for the one-touch key in order to give the user quick access to frequently used

titles in the system; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67

and col. 7, lines 1-34).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for

the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user

code of the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the Tomida

reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to another

user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference discloses a

user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other accounts.

Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or functions on the

system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is specific to a

current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's account on

the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system contains the

feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the current

operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names are

registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device

of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a user log

into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson '706 col.

7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 26: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the network facsimile machine as claimed in claim 22, further

comprising address registration determination part configured to determine whether a

mail address is registered for the specific user code (i.e. the system can determine if an

address of an email that is received by the facsimile machine is registered on the

system and specifically registered for a one-touch key. If the user is trying to transmit a

facsimile using the one-touch key, the system looks at the registered coded data on the

one-touch key and checks to see if a mail address is registered and stored for the one-

touch key or if the on-touch key only has a facsimile number; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, lines

1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34),

wherein said subject name specifying part specifies the mail address registered

for the specific user code as the transmission subject name when said address

registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the

specific user code (i.e. in figure 4, a name and an email address is associated with the

one-touch keys, which is considered as the identification codes. The one-touch key has

a mail address being registered as the address used for transmitting an email to another

facsimile device. This email address is designated, or specified, by the user. This

feature occurs when the actual subject names, or email address, in this scenario are not

registered and the user is asked in step 100 if the user would like to register the chosen

email address with the one-touch key. Also, since the mail address can be used as a

transmission subject name because any title of any kind can be used, the above feature

is performed. Therefore, the feature of specifying a mail address registered for the

specific user code as a transmission subject name when the subject name is

determined to not be registered for the mail data is performed; see fig. 4; col. 4, lines

57-66,col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee

is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to

send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of

McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the

memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. The user

account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a

current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the specific user code of

the current operator, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, in order to have user

authentication data for verification prior to enabling transmission of the message header

data for an email (as stated in McAfee '889 paragraph [0009]).

Re claim 27: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the communication apparatus as claimed in claim 14, wherein a

plurality of subject names are registered by said subject name registration part (i.e. in

the system, a plurality of subject names, or titles, are registered by the mechanism that

registers subject names in the title storage area (45d); see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-67,

col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach a plurality of subject names registered for

the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses a plurality of subject names registered for the specific user

code specific to the current operator (i.e. the Rachelson reference is similar to the

Tomida reference since both inventions have a user transmit a facsimile or email to

another user's address (same field of endeavor). However, the Rachelson reference

discloses a user logging into an account that may have different privileges than other

accounts. Since the current user of the system may have different permissions or

functions on the system than others, it is clear that a user code, or account number, is

specific to a current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are stored in the user's

account on the database contain titles for each message, the Rachelson system

contains the feature of having subject names registered for a specific user code of the

current operator of a user operating a facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of subject names

registered for the specific user code specific to the current operator, incorporated in the

device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to have a

user log into a system using an account number and password (as stated in Rachelson

'706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 28: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the communication apparatus as claimed in claim 27, wherein

when the specific user code specific to the current operator has been specified (i.e. in

the system, the one-touch keys are considered as the specific user code since the one-

touch keys are codes that represent titles or other receiving apparatuses that are

specified when the user activates or enters in the one-touch key in the system. The

system determines whether a certain one-touch key is specified when a user wants to

transmit a email or fax to a person or to save information relating to the fax, email or title

coded on the one-touch key; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, lines 1-67, col. 5, lines 1-67, col. 6,

lines 1-67 and col. 7, lines 1-34),

one of the plurality of subject names registered is automatically selected by the

subject name specifying part as the transmission subject name of the mail dam to be

transmitted (i.e. in the system, when the user wants to send a fax or email and activates

the code of the one-touch key, the system automatically specifies the name of the

receiving party, or the name of the subject receiving the transmission, that is registered

for the one-touch key. Also, if the user only wants to send an email, the system can

automatically specify one of the titles registered for the one-touch keys once the user

has chosen a respective one-touch key for the desired title. Lastly, the system can

automatically choose a default title for an email after an email address of a receiving

party has been specified and a title has not been specified by a one-touch key. Since a

default title can chosen from the memory (45e and 45f) automatically from the subject

names registered for the user in the title storage area (45d), which is also stored in

connection with a one-touch key. The same titles in memory are used in the email to be

transmitted to the receiving party. Since the email is transmitted with the overall email

as the title of the email, this can be considered as the transmission subject name of the

mail data to be transmitted; see figs. 3-7; col. 4, line 1 - col. 7, lines 1-34 and col. 8, line

25 – col. 9, line 31).

However, Tomida '255 fails to specifically teach a specific user code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the communication apparatus and subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee '889 discloses a specific user code, specific to a current operator (i.e. the user account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that is specific to a current operator; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]) and

subject name registered for the specific user code of the current operator (i.e. the system of McAfee is similar to the systems of Tomida and Rachelson since all the inventions are able to send emails with information from the facsimile devices. However, the invention of McAfee discloses that email recipients and subject data may be obtained from the memory of a facsimile device once a user's name and pin are verified. In paragraph [0025], it states that this information can be obtained from memory. Specifically in paragraph [0029], when validation of the user name and password occurs with the email server (which can be analogous to a fax gateway), then the MFP used then forwards related information that is considered as the message header (i.e. information containing a subject of an email, sending and receiving email addresses) to the email server. This is an example of a system that contains a subject and email addresses of recipients of information that are registered in memory in relation to the specific user login information of the current operator of the facsimile device; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the subject name

registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated in the device

of Tomida '255, in order to have user authentication data for verification prior to

enabling transmission of the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee

'889 paragraph [0009]).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee fails to specifically teach

the plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code

of the current operator (i.e. since the current user of the system may have different

permissions or functions on the system than others, it is clear that a user code, or

account number, is specific to a current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that are

stored in the user's account on the database contain titles for each message, the

Rachelson system contains the feature of having a plurality of subject names registered

for a specific user code of the current operator of a user operating a facsimile device;

see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of plurality of

subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator, incorporated

in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889, in order to

have a user log into a system using an account number and password (as stated in

Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Re claim 29: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

However, Tomida '255 fails to teach The communication apparatus as claimed in

claim 14, wherein the user code is an identification code characteristic of the user.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by McAfee '889. McAfee

'889 discloses wherein the user code is an identification code characteristic of the user

(i.e. the user account number and Pin is considered as a specific user code that

identifies a current operator of the system; see paragraphs [0024]-[0033]).

Therefore, in view of McAfee '889, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature wherein the user code is an

identification code characteristic of the user, incorporated in the device of Tomida '255,

in order to have user authentication data for verification prior to enabling transmission of

the message header data for an email (as stated in McAfee '889 paragraph [0009]).

Re claim 30: The teachings of Tomida '255 in view of McAfee '889 and Rachelson '706

are disclosed above.

Tomida '255 discloses the communication apparatus as claimed in claim 14, wherein

said subject name registration part registers a plurality of subject names (i.e. in the

system, the one touch keys are considered as the user codes since these one-touch

keys are coded by the user with information that is being used by the facsimile device.

In the system, the user registers titles to one-touch keys in the system. A plurality of

one-touch keys is used to register a plurality of titles that can be associated with the

one-touch keys. Also, interpreting the phrase "subject name" broadly in terms of the

claim, the one-touch keys can be used to also register the name of the person, or

subject, receiving the email or fax; see figs. 3-6; col. 4, line 1 - col. 6, line 10), and

said subject name specifying part automatically determines a subject name from

amongst the plurality of subject names registered, to employ as the transmission

subject name of the mail data to be transmitted (i.e. in the system, when the user wants

to send a fax or email and activates the code of the one-touch key, the system

automatically specifies the name of the receiving party, or the name of the subject

receiving the transmission, that is registered for the one-touch key. Also, if the user

only wants to send an email, the system can automatically specify one of the titles

registered for the one-touch keys once the user has chosen a respective one-touch key

for the desired title. Lastly, the system can automatically choose a default title for an

email after an email address of a receiving party has been specified and a title has not

been specified by a one-touch key. Since a default title can chosen from the memory

(45e and 45f) automatically from the subject names registered for the user in the title

storage area (45d), which is also stored in connection with a one-touch key. The same

titles in memory are used in the email to be transmitted to the receiving party. Since the

email is transmitted with the overall email as the title of the email, this can be

considered as the transmission subject name of the mail data to be transmitted; see

figs. 3-7; col. 4, line 1 - col. 7, lines 1-34 and col. 8, line 25 – col. 9, line 31).

However, the combination of Tomida '255 and McAfee fails to specifically teach

registers a plurality of subject names for the specific user code of the current operator

and the plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current

operator.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rachelson '706.

Rachelson '706 discloses registers a plurality of subject names for the specific user

code of the current operator and the plurality of subject names registered for the specific

user code of the current operator (i.e. since the current user of the system may have

different permissions or functions on the system than others, it is clear that a user code,

or account number, is specific to a current operator. Also, since the email or faxes that

are stored, or registered, in the user's account on the database contain titles for each

message, the Rachelson system contains the feature of having a plurality of subject

names registered for a specific user code of the current operator of a user operating a

facsimile device; see col. 7, ln 41 – col. 9, ln 35).

Therefore, in view of Rachelson '706, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of registering a

plurality of subject names for the specific user code of the current operator and the

plurality of subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator,

incorporated in the device of Tomida '255, as modified by the features of McAfee '889,

in order to have a user log into a system using an account number and password (as

stated in Rachelson '706 col. 7, lines 41-51).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

7.   Watanabe (USP 6762860) discloses a network photograph service that

associates titles with registered user IDs and passwords (see column 7).

8.   Cho (USP 6466956) discloses a system in which a user name and password is

associated with a user ID. Also the user ID is associated with a subject information

table that registers titles and files names with the user ID information (see figs. 4, 5 and

11).

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

      A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone number is

(571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30

Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571)-272-7406. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D./
/Chad Dickerson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625